

REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner Huson for the courtesies extended to the undersigned during a telephonic interview conducted on November 1, 2006. In the Office Action mailed July 25, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 and 21-28. By way of the foregoing amendments and the markings to show changes, Applicants have amended claim 1. The foregoing amendments are taken in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicant would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art.

I. Rejections under 35 USC 102 or 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-12 and 21-28 under 35 USC 102 or 103 as being unpatentable over Tilton et al. (US Patent 6,572,723) alone or additionally in view of Weaver et al. (US Patent 4,379,802). Without acquiescing in these rejections, Applicants have amended claim 1.

During the Interview between Examiner Huson and the undersigned, it was agreed that, if claim 1 were amended in the manner that it is currently amended, the claims of the present application would patentably distinguish the current references of record. Such agreement and the specifics of that agreement are written into the Interview Summary. On this basis, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the claims be withdrawn and also request that the claims be allowed.

By amending the application, the Applicants do not concede that the patent coverage available to them would not extend as far as the original claim. Rather, Applicants intend to file a continuation application to pursue the breadth of the claims as filed. Applicants believe that the Examiner has not made a sufficient showing of inherency of the teachings of the asserted prior art, especially given the lack of

teachings in the cited references of the properties that Applicants have recited in their claims.

Further, by the present amendment, it does not follow that the amended claims have become so perfect in their description that no one could devise an equivalent. After amendment, as before, limitations in the ability to describe the present invention in language in the patent claims naturally prevent the Applicants from capturing every nuance of the invention or describing with complete precision the range of its novelty or every possible equivalent. See, Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., 62 USPQ2d 1705 (2002). Accordingly, the foregoing amendments are made specifically in the interest of expediting prosecution and there is no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled.

PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Applicants respectfully request and petition an appropriate extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action, of at least one (1) month. Please charge deposit account no. 50-1097 in the amount of \$120.00. For any deficiencies, please charge Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due is hereby given.


CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Dated: 14 November, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Scott Chapple
Registration No. 46,287
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC
29 W. Lawrence Street
Suite 210
Pontiac, MI 48342
(248) 292-2920

Customer No. 25215